UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

300	100000		CONTRACT CONTRACT	
¥	1	Boses	1	B

2008 SEP 18 PM 3: 56

то		DISTRICT JUDGE / U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Sabraw CLERK US DISTRICT COURT				
FR	OM: R. Mul	lin, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 9/17/2008				
CA	SE NO.: <u>0</u>	7cv2183 DMS (BLM) DOCUMENT FILED BY: Petitioner DEPUTY				
CASE TITLE: Cunningham v. Marshall						
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Motion Extension of 10 Days Due to Avenal Prison Procedures						
Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:						
/	Local Rule	Discrepancy				
\mathbf{X}	5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation				
	5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper				
	5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.				
	7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely				
X	7.1 or 47.1	17.1 Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document				
	7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions				
	7.1	Missing table of contents				
	15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself				
	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order				
		Supplemental documents require court order				
		Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest				
		OTHER:				
		Date forwarded: 9/18/2008				
ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:						
4	The docum	The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.				
	The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.					
	Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers					
	Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant					
	to Local Rule 83.1 CHAMBERS OF: DANA M. SABRAW					
	Dated:	9/7/08 By:				